UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/SR.19
23 August 1996

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND
PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Forty-eighth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 19 August 1996, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. EIDE

CONTENTS

ELECTION OF OFFICERS (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Sub-Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.96-13521 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS (agenda item 1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that in the absence of Mr. Fix Zamudio, who had been called back to Mexico for consultations with his Government, Mr. Lindgren Alves had served as Vice-Chairman. On his return, Mr. Fix Zamudio had expressed the desire that Mr. Lindgren Alves should continue as Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the session.

2. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Sub-Commission agreed to the formal election of Mr. Lindgren Alves to the post of Vice-Chairman.

3. It was so decided.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

4. Mr. CHERNICHENKO said that he wished to place on record his view that since the Sub-Commission's resolutions concerning individual countries which repeated the resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights and other higher bodies inevitably politicized the work of the Sub-Commission and served no purpose whatsoever, he considered that it was pointless to support such resolutions. That did not, of course, affect his highly negative assessment of the actions of Governments that violated human rights.

5. Mr. JOINET observed that at least that meant that when the Sub-Commission adopted resolutions that were not before the Commission, its work was not politicized.

6. Mr. CHERNICHENKO said in response to a request for clarification by Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ, that he could not say how he would vote on individual resolutions although he could say that his general position would be reflected in his vote.

7. Mr. BOSSUYT proposed that when there was a request for a vote on resolutions, oral or written amendments, and related procedural issues the vote should be by secret ballot.

8. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Sub-Commission accepted the proposal.

9. It was so decided.

10. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ said that although he accepted the consensus, he nevertheless wished put on record his opposition to the proposal.

11. Mr. YIMER proposed that introductions to draft resolutions should be dispensed with to the extent possible.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Sub-Commission accepted Mr. Yimer's proposal.

13. It was so decided.

Question of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including policies of racial discrimination and segregation and of apartheid, in all countries, with particular reference to colonial and other dependent countries and territories: report of the Sub-Commission under Commission on Human Rights resolution 8 (XXIII) (agenda item 6) (continued)

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.2

14. Mr. WEISSBRODT introduced a revision to draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.2. At the end of operative paragraph 5, the list of issues should be deleted, so that the paragraph now read:

> "5. Encourages the permanent status negotiations begun pursuant to the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements;".

15. He said that the draft resolution was partially a response to draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.3. A similar duo of resolutions had been adopted the previous year. The proposed resolution used an even-handed approach to encourage all parties to foster a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

16. Mr. EL-HAJJÉ said he wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

17. The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

18. Mr. KHALIL said that although the resolution just adopted contained many positive points, it did not address the reality of the problems currently facing the peace process in the Middle East, where over 5,000 Palestinians were still in prison and signed agreements were being challenged. He would have liked to see some reference to Commission on Human Rights resolutions 1996/2, 3, 4 and 5, which referred to other important elements in the peace process.

19. With reference to the change in operative paragraph 7 from last year's "State of Israel" to the "Government of Israel", he took it that the change did not imply that agreements entered into by a Government on behalf of a State were not binding on that State.

20. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ agreed with Mr. Khalil that the resolution should have made some reference to the dangers facing the peace process, and that the Sub-Commission should be careful to take any future developments in the region into account when dealing with the issue at its next session.

21. Mr. GUISSÉ said that the revision had effectively removed potential areas of disagreement, but that side-stepping difficult issues was a step backwards as far as the peace process was concerned.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.3

22. Mr. WEISSBRODT said that the draft resolution represented a one-sided view of developments in the Middle East. The extensive reprinting and distribution of United Nations documents requested in paragraph 10 would be a waste of resources.

23. He proposed two amendments to address problems regarding the Palestinian Authority, and to make the draft resolution slightly more balanced. The first amendment would consist of a new eighth preambular paragraph reading:

> "Concerned at emerging human rights violations of Palestinians living in the territories administered by the Palestinian Authority,".

The second amendment would be in the form of a new operative paragraph reading:

> "11. Calls upon the Palestinian Authority:
>
> (a) To comply with all current international norms in the field of human rights, particularly relating to (1) freedom of expression, (2) treatment of detainees, and (3) administration of justice;
>
> (b) To provide greater access to its prisons and interrogators through international organizations;
>
> (c) To continue its cooperation with the advisory services offered by the Centre for Human Rights with a view to fostering human rights institutions."

24. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ sought clarification on the exact meaning of "emerging human rights violations"; he asked if it implied that human rights violations were already taking place in the territories. He also asked if Mr. Weissbrodt would vote for the resolution if the sponsors accepted the amendments.

25. Mr. GUISSÉ said that the Palestinian State had only recently been established after years of struggle, and was in the process of consolidation; it needed time to set up the institutions necessary to safeguard all human rights in its territory. Without in any way condoning human rights violations, he said that it was normal to allow newly created States a transitional period to become firmly established. Therefore, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, he could not accept the proposed amendment, which would distort it. He proposed that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred to allow time for further consultations.

26. Mr. EL-HAJJÉ agreed with Mr. Guissé's proposal, especially as it appeared that some text had inadvertently been omitted from paragraph 8.

27. Mr. WEISSBRODT, when pressed by Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ for an answer on how he would vote if his amendments were accepted, said he would decide how he would vote only when the final text was proposed, and that in any case he was not required to reveal his vote in a secret ballot. He was very willing, however, to enter into consultations with the sponsors, and offered to change the wording in his proposed amendment from "emerging human rights violations" to "reports of human rights violations" in the new eighth preambular paragraph. He was not trying to suggest that the human rights situation under the Palestinian Authority was critical, and was surprised at the resistance of the sponsors to language that was broadly similar to that used in the previous year's resolution.

28. Mr. JOINET said that he had not sponsored either resolution on the Middle East at the current session because he felt that, in the light of recent developments, the Sub-Commission's continued inability to find sufficient common ground to produce a single resolution on the subject detracted from its credibility. He suggested that Mr. Weissbrodt and Mr. El-Hajjé should meet at the beginning of the next session to draft a resolution that would be acceptable to all.

29. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ said that however important it might be to achieve a consensus, the Sub-Commission's credibility depended, in his view, on factors of far greater import than whether or not it could agree on a single resolution on the Middle East. He noted that the amendment proposed by Mr. Weissbrodt contained a number of points that had not figured in resolution 1995/9.

30. Mr. EL-HAJJÉ said that while nobody disputed the desirability of achieving peace in the Middle East, the Sub-Commission could not overlook such continued violations of human rights as detention without trial, demolition of houses and confiscation of land. Two separate resolutions were necessary to address two very different dimensions of the same situation.

31. Mr. WEISSBRODT suggested that his proposed amendment, as modified, should be put to the vote.

32. Mrs. WARZAZI, supported by Mr. JOINET, moved that the Sub-Commission should defer consideration of the draft resolution in order to allow time for consultations.

33. It was so decided.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.4

34. Mr. GUISSÉ said that the draft resolution was very similar to resolution 1995/10 and was designed to reassure the population of Kosovo that their plight had not been forgotten.

35. Mr. EL-HAJJÉ, a sponsor of the draft resolution, suggested that subparagraph (e) of the fourth preambular paragraph should be deleted and that the first line of operative paragraph 6 should be amended to read "Calls upon the States Members of the United Nations not to recognize [...]."

36. Mr. CHERNICHENKO said that he did not agree with the content of the draft resolution. The human rights situation in Kosovo was admittedly not ideal but a far more balanced approach was required, particularly in recognition of the ongoing cooperation between the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). He had very serious doubts about operative paragraph 6, even with Mr. El-Hajjé's proposed revision. He failed to see what practical gain could be derived from urging United Nations bodies or member States not to recognize the legal effects of the Citizenship Law. Moreover, he could think of corresponding legislation in many other States that was flagrantly discriminatory and reserved the right to encourage non-recognition of the effects of that legislation if the draft resolution was adopted in its existing form.

37. Mr. WEISSBRODT said that he had sponsored the draft resolution on the understanding that certain revisions would be made: deletion of subparagraph (e) of the fourth preambular paragraph and insertion of the phrase "and to apply all other legislation without discrimination" at the end of operative paragraph 2 (a). He shared Mr. Chernichenko's doubts about operative paragraph 6 and suggested that it should be deleted.

38. Mr. BOSSUYT, a sponsor of the draft resolution, said that he supported Mr. Weissbrodt on all three points.

39. Mr. EL-HAJJÉ said that the omission of the phrase mentioned by Mr. Weissbrodt at the end of operative paragraph 2 (a) had been an oversight. He agreed with the proposal to delete operative paragraph 6.

40. Mrs. WARZAZI suggested that the word "reporter" in the French version of operative paragraph 2 (a) should be replaced by the word "abroger" in order to bring it into line with the English version.

41. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Sub-Commission wished to delete subparagraph (e) of preambular paragraph 4 and operative paragraph 6 and to amend operative paragraph 2 (a) in the light of the proposals by Mr. Weissbrodt and Mrs. Warzazi.

42. It was so agreed.

43. A vote was taken by secret ballot.

44. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Alfonso Martínez and Mr. Yimer acted as tellers.

45. The draft resolution was adopted by 15 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.5

46. Mrs. MBONU said that the draft resolution raised a large number of problems for her, as she had already explained at the previous meeting.

47. Mr. GUISSÉ said that he also had difficulties with the text.

48. Mr. BOSSUYT explained that the draft resolution had been submitted under agenda item 6 because it could affect the way in which other draft resolutions submitted under that agenda item were dealt with, but it had also been discussed under agenda item 3. More thought would obviously have to be given to it. He therefore suggested that further consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed until later on in the session.

49. After a discussion in which Mr. GUISSÉ, Mr. BOSSUYT, Mr. YIMER, Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ, Mr. FAN Guoxiang, Mr. KHALIFA, Mr. CHERNICHENKO and Mr. LINDGREN ALVES took part, Mr. BOSSUYT announced that the draft resolution would be withdrawn, although he might submit a similar text under agenda item 3.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.6

50. Mr. BOSSUYT proposed that the word "voluntary" should be inserted before the word "return" in the first line of paragraph 8. Otherwise, he hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

51. Mrs. WARZAZI noted that in paragraph 3 the draft resolution again requested the Secretary-General to arrange for the necessary inquiries to establish responsibility for the attack committed on 6 April 1994. However, the Secretary-General had already drawn up a report and it had been submitted to the Security Council, whose members had decided to keep it to themselves. Thus the Secretary-General should be requested, not to make inquiries, but to publish the report.

52. Mr. BOSSUYT explained that there was some confusion between the situation with regard to Rwanda and the situation with regard to Burundi. The report to which Mrs. Warzazi had referred had been requested by the Secretary-General on the assassination of the President of Burundi on 21 October 1993 and the massacres that had followed. The report had been transmitted some time previously to the Security Council, which had only recently authorized its publication. There was no report by the Secretary-General on the attack on the aircraft carrying the Presidents of Rwanda and Burundi on 6 April 1994, and that was why the Secretary-General was again being requested to arrange for inquiries to be made. Moreover, the general in charge had not been authorized by the Secretary-General to give evidence before a Belgian military court.

53. The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.7

54. Mr. BOSSUYT said that paragraphs 1 and 2 needed to be amended because, since the draft resolution had been submitted, the Security Council had authorized the publication of the report in question. He therefore proposed, on behalf of the sponsors, that the beginning of paragraph 1 should read:

> "Welcomes the publication authorized by the Security Council of the report ...", while paragraph 2 should begin
>
> "Hopes that the publication of this report will make it possible to remove ...".

55. Mr. YIMER said that the draft resolution was by and large acceptable to him. However, he could not agree to certain paragraphs. In fact, the resolution on Burundi adopted by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) seemed better than the one before the Sub-Commission.

56. In the sixth preambular paragraph the word "Noting" implied indifference and was therefore inappropriate to describe the Sub-Commission's response to the rejection of the framework agreement by extremists. "Deploring" or "Deeply deploring" or "Condemning" would be better. The paragraph should either be deleted or amended along those lines. Moreover, in the eighth preambular paragraph the words "had resulted" created some confusion

as to the relationship between the failure of the process of democratization and the unconstitutional manner in which Pierre Buyoya had usurped power. A clearer wording would be appreciated.

57. With regard to paragraph 5, he noted that CERD supported the economic sanctions imposed on Burundi. It was therefore surprising that two different United Nations bodies should take opposing stands on the issue. In any case, the regional summit meeting that had imposed the sanctions had made it clear that relief supplies for refugees and displaced persons would be allowed through. The Sub-Commission should therefore not express concern at the situation, and the paragraph should be reworded accordingly.

58. Mr. GUISSÉ endorsed Mr. Yimer's remarks. Since the situation was not very clear, any tendentious resolution by the Sub-Commission could do harm. He was therefore unable to support the text as it stood.

59. Mrs. WARZAZI said that it was important that any resolution adopted by the Sub-Commission should not be interpreted as support for one group or another. Furthermore, it might be advisable to omit the sixth preambular paragraph because it would not be appropriate for the Sub-Commission to adopt a text which might run counter to a text adopted by CERD, which had expressed its full support for the Arusha agreement. The beginning of paragraph 5 should be amended to read:

> "5. Expresses the hope that the economic sanctions will not endanger the already highly precarious situation ...".

60. Mr. BOSSUYT said that he could accept the new wording for the beginning of paragraph 5 proposed by Mrs. Warzazi. With regard to the eighth preambular paragraph, there seemed to be some misunderstanding concerning the words "which had resulted in the first free elections being held in 1993". It was not the "failure" which had led to those elections, but the "democratization of Burundi public life". However, since some confusion had arisen, he proposed that the words "which had resulted in the first free elections being held in 1993" should be deleted. A neutral wording had been used in the sixth preambular paragraph because it referred to an intervention by foreign troops, a matter on which the Sub-Commission ought not to pass any judgement. The best solution would be to delete that paragraph.

61. The draft resolution, as orally amended and revised, was adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.8

62. Mr. AL-DORY (Observer for Iraq) said that the draft resolution was based on an incorrect view of the situation in his country and was dependent on information and allegations that needed to be validated. For instance, it was not true that military attacks with heavy artillery were being made on Kurdish areas, which were, in any case, under foreign protection. Moreover, the draft resolution lacked balance because it made no reference to any positive steps such as the recent referendum and elections, the abolition of capital punishment or the release of political prisoners. While in the preamble a reference was made to the suffering of the people of Iraq and to the danger

of a deterioration in the health situation, it was not made clear that all the suffering of the people of Iraq, from north to south, was caused by the continuation of the economic embargo.

63. The operative part of the draft resolution lacked credibility and precision. For instance, how could it happen that the Government of Iraq was putting the northern areas under siege when it had already withdrawn from them? Moreover, the decrees mentioned in paragraph 6 had been abolished, so there was no justification for mentioning them.

64. The deployment of human rights monitors mentioned in paragraph 1 was unacceptable because it would amount to a violation of Iraq's sovereignty and interference in its internal affairs. In paragraph 2 mention should be made of the memorandum of understanding on the oil-for-food formula reached between Iraq and the United Nations, and of the party that had been responsible for postponing its application. With regard to paragraph 3, it was doubtful whether it was within the Sub-Commission's competence to request a State to withdraw its military forces from any area of its own territory. The terrorist acts against United Nations personnel had to be seen in the light of inter-Kurdish fighting and outside interference in the northern areas of the country over which the Government had no control. The internal embargo mentioned in paragraph 4 had not been confirmed by many international institutions. The Special Rapporteur had received positive treatment from the Government and had been invited to visit Iraq, as had happened in 1992. However, he had then done everything possible to abuse his position, in particular by providing a pretext for dividing the country and destroying its national unity, with potentially dangerous consequences for the whole region, and for changing the regime. His Government hoped that members of the Sub-Commission would not be influenced by the pressures brought to bear by certain States, since, despite the Special Rapporteur's activities, the Government of Iraq had continued to cooperate with the full range of human rights institutions. It therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be rejected.

65. Mrs. WARZAZI said it was regrettable that the sponsors of the draft resolution had apparently failed to consult the observer delegation directly concerned before submitting their text for consideration. That text would have gained in impartiality and objectivity had it reflected certain positive measures taken by the Government of Iraq. Sponsors of draft resolutions on countries must always consult all the parties involved: members, NGOs, and the countries concerned.

66. A vote was taken by secret ballot.

67. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Ali Khan and Mr. Weissbrodt acted as tellers.

68. The draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to 6, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.9/Rev.1

69. Mrs. MBONU said she was encouraged by the fact that, for the first time in the nine years she had been attending the Sub-Commission, the observer delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran had expressed concern at

allegations of human rights violations in its country. Of course, the situation of human rights in that country still left a great deal to be desired. Nevertheless, there had been a few positive developments. It was unfortunate that those developments were not reflected in the draft resolution, the tone of which was, as usual, strongly condemnatory. The Government should be congratulated on those developments and urged to take further positive measures; the role of the Sub-Commission was not to castigate, but to prevail on Governments to cooperate with it. Too much condemnation and too little encouragement would simply cause the Government to withdraw into its shell.

70. Mr. JOINET said it was true that the reports of the Special Representative and the thematic rapporteurs cited a few examples of positive measures taken. More often, however, they cited allegations of human rights violations - and indeed, not just allegations, but proven instances of such violations. Clearly, the draft resolution should cite established facts rather than mere allegations. He therefore proposed that, in the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "Gravely concerned at allegations of" should be replaced by the words "Gravely concerned at reports of". For the same reason, in paragraph 1, the word "alleged" should be deleted.

71. Mr. WEISSBRODT said he supported the proposed amendments. Furthermore, in the penultimate preambular paragraph, he proposed replacing the word "murders" by the word "killings".

72. Mr. BOSSUYT said he thought the proposed amendments would be acceptable to all the sponsors.

73. Mrs. PALLEY said that, particularly in view of comments made concerning improvements in the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, she was not in favour of Mr. Joinet's proposed amendments, which would have the effect of further harshening the wording of the draft resolution. In the interests of time saving, the best course would be for her to withdraw her sponsorship of the draft resolution.

74. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ requested a vote on the draft resolution.

75. Mr. ZIARAN (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that in spite of the compelling arguments put forward to the effect that the best way in which the Sub-Commission could contribute to the promotion of human rights would be for it to depoliticize its work and concentrate on new developments, the Sub-Commission was yet again reacting to politically motivated interests. The draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.9/Rev.1) was a case in point: it ran counter to the standards, criteria and guidelines laid down by the Sub-Commission and the Commission. Thus, Sub-Commission resolution 1 (XXIV) of 13 August 1971 clearly stated that communications were admissible only if they were considered with the replies of the Governments concerned, reliably attested, not politically motivated and not based exclusively on reports disseminated by mass media, and if domestic remedies had been exhausted. Those originating the allegations should have direct and reliable knowledge of the violations, should act in good faith in accordance with recognized principles of human

rights, and should not resort to politically motivated stands. Paragraph 8 of Commission resolution 1992/66 reaffirmed that the Sub-Commission should make a thorough examination of information concerning alleged human rights violations. Pursuant to Sub-Commission decision 1995/115, reliable sources, including the reports of Special Rapporteurs and Chairmen-Rapporteurs of Working Groups of the Commission, should be taken into account in the examination of agenda item 6.

76. The allegations referred to in the draft resolution failed to meet any of those criteria. The text was mainly based on unsubstantiated and groundless allegations provided by a terrorist organization that was commissioning terrorism with impunity from a neighbouring country. At any rate, his delegation's request that the sponsors should provide it with information confirming the reliability of those allegations had thus far met with no response.

77. The year 1996 had seen the publication of two reports by thematic rapporteurs and one report by the Special Representative on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Those reports could constitute an objective basis for consideration by the Sub-Commission of the situation of human rights in his country. The Sub-Commission had that basis to hand: it could trust its own special rapporteurs and special representatives. Yet the sponsors of the draft resolution had overlooked those reports.

78. In paragraph 126 of his report (E/CN.4/1996/59), Mr. Maurice Copithorne, the Special Representative, stated that "The Islamic Republic of Iran is a dynamic society. There is clearly a range of opinions on most issues facing the society, and in many areas there is evidently active and fairly open debate. Arguably, this could be a prelude for significant change." In paragraph 129 of that report, he also acknowledged the cooperation of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the first six months of his mandate. In paragraph 94 of his report on religious intolerance (E/CN.4/1996/95/Add.2), Mr. Abdelfattah Amor, the Special Rapporteur, referring to the recognized non-Muslim religious minorities, stated that he "believes that their situation as a minority is [...] apparently satisfactory ...". In paragraph 103 of his report, he stated that "... the situation of the recognized Muslim and non-Muslim minorities appears to be fairly satisfactory". Those observations should be compared with the provisions of the draft resolution now before the Sub-Commission.

79. That draft resolution, if adopted, would discredit the Sub-Commission. It was regrettable that, in spite of the financial crisis afflicting the United Nations, valuable financial resources were being squandered on the publication, translation and distribution of baseless allegations. The draft resolution also sent out a wrong message, namely, that it made no difference whether a Government cooperated with or refused to respond to requests by special representatives and special rapporteurs to be permitted to make visits. It appeared that their reports were prepared merely for subsequent consignment to the archives. That trend, if continued, would undermine incentives for Governments to cooperate. He therefore appealed to members to vote against the draft resolution.

80. Mr. LINDGREN ALVES said that while progress made in the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran was admittedly slight, it should nevertheless be encouraged. Yet the draft resolution, after welcoming the cooperation extended by the Government, went on to declare itself "gravely concerned" at a whole range of alleged human rights violations. In his view, it should at most "take note" of those allegations; for to go further would be to prejudge the situation. Likewise, some reference to "allegations" should be retained in paragraph 1.

81. Mr. JOINET said that the purpose of his proposed amendments had not been to render the tone of the draft resolution harsher, but rather to reflect the fact that, although (to take just one area as an example) there did not appear to be generalized persecution of religious minorities, some proven instances were nevertheless cited by the Special Rapporteur, in addition to a large number of as yet unsubstantiated allegations. He took the point, however, that if the Sub-Commission was too stinting in its encouragement, the Iranian Government might simply decline to cooperate further.

82. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Sub-Commission wished to continue its consideration of draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/1996/L.9/Rev.1 at its next meeting.

83. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.